

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

### Boys & Girls Clubs of Michigan City

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Meeting Standard (3)	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Exceeding Standard (4)	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting	Satisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Exceeding Standard (4)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 3:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Boys & Girls Clubs of Michigan City's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).*

### ACTION NEEDED:

**Progress Reporting:** Although it does not affect the overall rating for this section, please review the "Progress Reporting" section below and ensure that progress reports are revised for next year to include the two additional pieces of information noted.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Boys & Girls Clubs of Michigan City  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 5/7/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tutor training agenda</li> <li>Description of informal, frequent classroom visits</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An agenda was submitted for November 2007 training conducted that included information about progress reporting, lesson plans, goals, and general items such as attendance and administrative responsibilities.</li> <li>Frequent, informal classroom visits are made by the provider to tutors' classrooms. Any issues that arise are addressed on an individual basis.</li> </ul>
Progress Reporting	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SES agreements</li> <li>SES contract with Michigan City</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>Documentation of progress reports sent</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports provide information about student goals, progress toward goals, general student performance, areas in which the student needs help, additional comments, and a checklist for indicating that the progress report has gone home, to the teacher, and to the district.</li> <li>Progress reports were filled out in a parent-friendly manner and included detailed information about student progress.</li> <li>Survey results from one district surveyed indicate that progress reports have been sent in a timely manner.</li> <li>Progress reports list student goals from the individual learning plan or from the SES agreement; goals may be different for each progress report, depending on</li> </ul>

					<p>which areas were specifically covered in that particular progress reporting window.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports provide detail about what students have worked on and how much progress they have made by doing activities/lessons assigned.</li> <li>• SES agreements have specific, measurable goals listed.</li> <li>• <a href="#">As per IDOE progress report checklist sent to providers in December 2007, progress reports also need to include the following information:</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Student's school</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">A written statement that recommendations regarding how the progress report can be improved can be made by calling or emailing the provider.</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of process to develop individual learning plans</li> <li>• Individual learning plans</li> <li>• Explanation of connection between assessment and standards</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual learning plans include pre-assessment scores as well as specific goals for the student to accomplish during tutoring (ultimately the same as those listed on the SES agreement).</li> <li>• Individual learning plans include specific strategies for addressing all standards listed, including activities that will be undertaken to meet goals.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans offer detailed intervention strategies for use with students.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans are developed using Woodcock-Johnson pre-assessments as well as informal classroom assessments and classroom teacher input. Running records and daily observation are used for continuous assessment.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans specifically identify exactly how the student will work on each standard area and which particular area will be covered in that particular standard area.</li> <li>• Goals and activities noted on the individual learning plans match goals and</li> </ul>

					<p>standards identified on the SES agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Woodcock-Johnson assessment as currently used covers several Math and Reading standards. In 2008-2009, additional sections of the Woodcock-Johnson will be used. An amendment will be submitted that further details the connections between those components and Indiana standards.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Boys & Girls Clubs of Michigan City  
**SITE:** Knapp Elementary School  
 321 Bolka Ave., Michigan City, IN 46360  
**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** A.D.  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 2

**DATE:** 4/23/08  
**REVIEWER:** MC/CE  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:30PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			<b>X</b>		Two students had just started the program and were taking their pre-assessments, which were timed by the tutor. The other student was working on a word worksheet, changing letters to meet definitions provided. The tutor interacted with both groups of students. While the tutor gave instructions to the two students taking pre-assessments, the other student worked independently on an assigned task. Once the students began taking each assessment, the tutor worked individually with the student on the task. While working with the student doing the language arts activity, the tutor utilized a variety of strategies to help him come up with the right answers, such as vocabulary clues and hints. If the student still had difficulty, the tutor used auditory and visual cues to help. The tutor also had the student read the words out loud to help him practice pronunciation of the words, and the tutor corrected the student if he made errors in pronunciation. The tutor tried to help the student access prior knowledge to come up with the answer on his own. For the two students working on pre-assessments, the tutor set the timer each time to ensure that the tests were properly administered. The tutor indicated to the students that the pre-assessments would help her know what they needed to work on, and that they would use periodic ongoing assessment to chart progress toward goals. Administration of pre-assessments and tutor explanation to students of how pre-assessments will be utilized matches description in provider's originally approved application. Observed tutoring lesson with student working on language arts also included instructional techniques and activities described in the provider's originally approved application.
			<b>X</b>		The instruction observed with the student working on language arts was clear, and it

Instruction is clear					appeared that the student understood what he was expected to work on. The tutor utilized a variety of instructional strategies to help the student in areas that were unclear and to help the student access prior knowledge. When working with the students taking the pre-assessment, the tutor gave clear instructions to them (about the length of the assessment, the purpose, and how to fill out the assessment). Because students were taking pre-assessments, additional instruction or coaching was not observed (which is highly appropriate for pre-assessment administration).
Time on task is appropriate				X	All three students remained on task throughout the time observed. Even when working independently, the student not taking the pre-assessment remained on task and had a clear understanding of what was expected. The students working on the pre-assessments remained on task; the tutor's explaining the purpose of the assessments and maintaining the timer appeared to help keep the on task, because students understood why they were taking the assessments and how important they were. The tutor was adept at rotating between the students to ensure that they stayed focused on the task at hand. Although each group was working on something different, the tutor never missed a beat; not more than 3-5 seconds ever elapsed where students were not having interaction with the tutor or working on their assessments. The room was very quiet and conducive to learning.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable				X	The tutor did a very good job rotating between the group of students taking the pre-assessment and the student working on language arts. When giving instructions to the students doing the pre-assessments, she ensured that the other student knew what he was supposed to be working on. When working with the other student, she utilized a variety of instructional strategies as well as visual and auditory techniques. She used strategies to help the student access prior knowledge to come up with correct answers, as well as a variety of vocabulary clues. She never struggled with transitions between the group working on the pre-assessments and the student working on language arts. The tutor also seemed to have a good awareness of each student's needs and was familiar with the pre-assessment process and the use of pre-assessment results as well as the provider's approved program.
Student/instructor ratio: 3:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Observed ratio of 3:1 matches that from original approved application of 5:1 or lower.